

**REMARKS**

Consideration of the above-identified application in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully submit that this Application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, 12, 14-18, 21, 24-29, and 31-42 were pending in this application. By this paper, claims 1, 2, 5-9, 11, 12, 14-18, 21, 24-29, and 31-42 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer and claims 43-62 have been added.

No new matter will be added to the application by entry of any of new claims. Entry is respectfully requested.

The Office Action has rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 14-16, 25-29, 32-33, 35-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being unpatentable in view of Wergelend (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148). The Office Action has rejected claims 9, 11, 12, 17, 21, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being upatentable over Wergeland; claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wergeland in view of Narayanaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,358); claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wergeland in view of Segal (U.S. Patent No. 6,765,557); claims 24 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wergeland in view of Hollstrom (U.S. Patent No. 6,968,365); and claim 42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Wergeland in view of Kubo (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,715). Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 43-56 are in allowable form.

Applicants' claim 43 recites:

A mobile terminal comprising:

a processor;

a memory coupled to the processor for storing data provided by the processor;

a display coupled to the processor for displaying images provided by the processor;

a splitting application configured to split received data into at least two parts for displaying at least two substantially different images; and

a short-range transmitter coupled to the processor and configured to transmit at least one of the at least two parts to an external display device.

Accordingly, claim 43 requires a splitting application that splits data into at least two parts “for displaying at least two substantially different images.” There is nothing in Wergeland that discloses a mobile terminal that is equipped with “a splitting application configured to split received data into at least two parts for displaying at least two substantially different images.”

Rather, Wergeland teaches the transmission of the same images:

“Accordingly, one or more frames of image data may be captured in the camera accessory, for example, under control of the mobile terminal and thereafter compressed in the camera accessory, for example, by a compression block associated with a processor or the like, according to one or more compression formats. The captured frames and the compressed frames may be transferred further over an air interface while captured image frames may be displayed locally on the display associated with the mobile terminal.” (col. 3, lines 36-47) (emphasis supplied).

Accordingly, Wergeland does disclose all of the subject matter recited in claim 43.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 43 is in allowable form. For similar reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 49, 54, and 57 are also in allowable form. Since claims 44-48 depend from claim 43, claims 50-53 depend from claim 49, claims 55-56 depends from claim 54, and claims 58-62 depend from claim 57, these claims are also in allowable form.

Applicants have not independently addressed the rejections of the dependent claims. Applicants submit that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as to why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed supra, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicants however, reserve the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the above-stated reasons, this application is respectfully asserted to be in condition for allowance. An early and favorable examination on the merits is requested. In the event that a telephone conference would facilitate the examination of this application in any way, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided.

Application Serial No. 09/639,196  
Reply to Office Action dated: August 21, 2006  
Paper dated: December 21, 2006

Docket No. 4208-4353


**AUTHORIZATION**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for consideration of this Request to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4353.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or which may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for an extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to Deposit Account No. 13-4500, Order No. 4208-4353.

Respectfully submitted,  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Dated: December 21, 2006

By:   
Scott Bittman  
Registration No. 55,007

Correspondence Address:  
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.  
3 World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281-2101  
(212) 415-8700 Telephone  
(212) 415-8701 Facsimile